UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,315	07/08/2003	Shinichiro Hamada	239875US2SRD	8249

22850	7590	02/08/2006

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/614,315	HAMADA, SHINICHIRO
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James H. Blackwell	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>21-27</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>08 July 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/8/03, 11/8/05</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in the reply filed on 10/27/2005 is

acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that a search and examination of the

entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner, whereas it would

be a serious burden on Applicants to prosecute and maintain separate applications.

This is not found persuasive because the invention is generally directed to GUI

operations related to an editor, especially Claims 21-27. In addition, the Specification is

91 pages long, and recites subject matter other than that specifically related to the

claims.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2.   Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application.

3.   Claims 1, 13-15, and 19-20 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-3, and 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Anuff et al. (hereinafter Anuff, U.S. Patent No. 6,327,628 filed 05/19/2000, issued

12/04/2001).

In regard to independent Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claim 13),

Anuff teaches *displaying on a display unit a structured document having a document structure composed of a plurality of elements* (e.g., see Fig. 2).

Anuff also teaches *editing the displayed structured document based on a partial document defined as an operating unit in advance composed of at least one of the elements which coincident with, or is included in, the displayed structured document* in that some "portlets" (Anuff's *encapsulated modules*) displayed as a part of the Web Portal "front page" can be edited by the user of the portal page, while other portlets are not editable by the user (Col. 4, lines 10-14; Fig. 2).

Anuff also teaches *creating parts data* (metadata) in that an administrator of the portal has the ability to generate new portlets (called pages by Anuff) that contain information about the page, such as layout, styles, and appearance. These features constitute the claimed (*partial document and position information on the document structure of the partial document based on information contained in the partial document, the information representing that the partial document is the operating unit*).

Anuff also teaches *storing the structured document in a storage unit as a set of the parts data* in that once the new portlet (page) is created, it is published making it available to users who can then add or are presented the portal on their main portal pages (Col. 8, lines 14-64; Figs. 5a-b). The act of publishing in this context typically involves storing the portlet on a server and then announcing the availability of that portlet to the user through various means.

Given that <u>Anuff</u> teaches creating parts data, it follows that an administrator also has the ability to *edit and make updates* to said portlets (pages). Editing operations would typically have been performed in part on the information about the page, such as layout, styles, and appearance as taught above.

As to whether or not the administrator performs *editing to portlets that are not targeted for operation according to the contents of operation relevant to the partial document selected as an operating target*, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention in light of <u>Anuff's</u> teachings to conclude that an administrator would typically not want to make edits to portlets that are currently published, but would rather make edits to portlets that are currently "offline" and thus not available to the users. This would have provided the benefit of avoiding situations where an active portlet suddenly became unavailable or "frozen" to an end user due to editing or otherwise changing an active portal by the administrator.

In regard to dependent Claim 2, <u>Anuff</u> teaches that *the partial document includes, as additional information of the partial document: a type of the partial document* (Fig. 2 shows a type of portlet such as Bookmarks, Search, Company Directory, News, and Discussion Boards).

<u>Anuff</u> also teaches *at least one conversion rule for converting a data format of the partial document in another data format* in that each of the portlets has associated with it layout rules containing groups on a specific HTML page of the portal, groups contain a set of modules specific to one user of the portal. With respect to figure 2, for example, the layout in the illustrated page contains two groups, left and right columns

with one group having two modules and the other three modules (Col. 7, lines 64-67;

Col. 8, lines 1-13). The point is that portlets according to Anuff, the portlets obey rules

for at least initially placing the individual portlets on the portal page (via JSP or ASP

code).

Anuff also teaches *link information for a partial document in another structured*

document displayed on the display unit as the partial document (see Fig. 2; Bookmarks,

News, and Discussion Boards contain hyperlinks to other structured documents (HTML,

XML, or modules like Active Server Pages, etc.).

Anuff also teaches *at least one of a type and an insertion position of another*

partial document which can be inserted into the partial document, and the additional

information is included in the parts data in that both the user and the administrator can

affect the look and feel of individual portlets (Fig. 2, Col. 2, lines 1-20).

In regard to dependent Claim 3, Anuff teaches *changing...position information*

contained in parts data corresponding to the partial document in association with

position of a move destination in that, for example, page ordering is controlled by a

Page Ordering object within the object model. This object holds the collection of

published pages, and supports re-ordering of the pages. This is a portion of the API that

can be used, for instance, to affect the relative tab positions of published pages. In an

implementation of the administration user interface, it can use the API to allow the portal

administrator to re-order pages visually (Col. 8, lines 57-64).

In addition, Anuff teaches that their portal server in an object-oriented system

built on an object model that includes objects for Components, Managers and Services,

Modules, Views, Pages and Page ordering, Layouts, Users, Permissions, Content

Parsers, Data Storage and Tasks (Col. 4, lines 60-67). Objects such as these are

designed to contain information about each of the portlets present on the portal page

such as those relating to layout; which would typically include positional information as

to where a given portlet was placed at any given time on the portal page. The act of

moving would prompt an update to the portion of a portlet on the portal page and the

modules mentioned above would contain and store the updated information related to

the move.

In regard to dependent Claim 8, Anuff teaches that *the parts data...includes a*

plurality of the conversion rules in that each of the portlets has associated with it layout

rules containing groups on a specific HTML page of the portal, groups contain a set of

modules specific to one user of the portal. With respect to figure 2, for example, the

layout in the illustrated page contains two groups, left and right columns with one group

having two modules and the other three modules (Col. 7, lines 64-67; Col. 8, lines 1-13).

The point is that portlets, according to Anuff, obey rules for at least initially placing the

individual portlets on the portal page (via JSP or ASP code).

Thus, Anuff teaches that layout rules exist for placing the portlets onto the portal

page (*a display format the partial document one of the conversion targeted for operation*

by using rules).

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Anuff teaches *deleting...parts data*

corresponding the partial document targeted for operation and parts data corresponding

to the partial document contained in the partial document targeted for operation from the

storage unit in that an end user has the ability to delete individual portlets (partial

documents) from their portal page. Though not stated explicitly, the act of deleting a

portlet from a portal page would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of invention, as it would have typically involved removing everything associated

with that portlet from the users page including the claimed *parts data*. Similarly, an

administrator can also delete portlets. One advantage of having a delete wipe out all

components of a given portlet would have been to provide the "deleter" with additional

storage space.

In regard to dependent Claims 10-11, Claims 10-11 contain subject matter

similar to that found in Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 13) and are rejected along the same

lines of reasoning.

In regard to dependent Claim 12, <u>Anuff</u> fails to teach *extracting a partial*

document in a range specified by a user from among the partial documents displayed

on the display unit. However, extracting a partial document as claimed amounts to

performing, for example, an operation whereby a user places a mouse at a selected

starting point, and clicks and drags the mouse, highlighting the text for selection, then

performing either a cut or copy operation, resulting in extracting such selected

information from the document. Such an operation was typically used and known and

would have been an obvious technique to perform such an operation to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention, in light of <u>Anuff's</u> prior teachings regarding metadata (parts data) (Col. 6,

lines 34-46 discusses objects related to portlets containing metadata (parts data)), to create and store metadata related to the creation of new objects related to new portlets, as claimed.

In regard to independent Claims 14-15, Claims 14-15 reflect the document editing method as claimed in Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 13), and are rejected along the same rationale.

In addition, <u>Anuff</u> teaches a portal server (see Abstract).

In regard to dependent Claim 16 (and similarly dependent Claim 17), <u>Anuff</u> teaches *a unit configured to insert at least information representing a partial document ... when information representing a partial document ... is not included in the structured document to be distributed to the client terminal* in that the portal server can provide modules (portlets) to the user without the module offering specific content (until that is, the user, if offered the option, to configure and/or enable the module to provide specifically requested content). So, the module (information representing a partial document) can be included without also including specific content (Col. 4, lines 6-14; Fig. 2).

In regard to dependent Claim 18 (and similarly dependent Claim 19), Claim 18 (and similarly Claim 19) contain subject matter that is similar to that found in Claims 8 and 16 (and similarly Claim 17) and is rejected along similar lines of reasoning.

In regard to independent Claim 20, Claim 20 reflects the document editing method as claimed in Claim 1 (and similarly Claim 13), and is rejected along the same rationale.

In addition, <u>Anuff</u> teaches a portal server (see Abstract).

6.   Claims 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anuff

in view of Luebbert (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,628 filed 08/29/1994, issued 07/16/1996).

In regard to dependent Claim 4, <u>Anuff</u> fails to *teach changing,...position*

information contained in first parts data corresponding to the parts data representing the

first partial document in association with an insertion position in the second structured

document; and storing second parts data obtained as a result of the change in the

storage unit as parts data on the second structured document. However, <u>Luebbert</u>

teaches cutting from one document comprising text from another set (i.e. Chinese

characters), which is pasted (saved) into an existing word processing document.

Metadata associated with the pasted text is added to metadata already present in the

existing document. This metadata includes position information, and conversion rules

(see Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention to combine the teachings of <u>Anuff</u> and <u>Luebbert</u> as both inventions relate to

editing document objects. Adding the teaching of <u>Luebbert</u> allows for the inclusion of

metadata associated with pasted data in to a document object, providing the benefit of

in-document conversion of text.

In regard to dependent Claims 5-6, Claims 5 and 6 contain subject matter that

is similar to that found in Claim 4 and is rejected along similar lines of reasoning.

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Claim 7 contains subject matter that is similar

to that found in Claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.

In addition, <u>Anuff</u> teaches *storing, when the partial document targeted for operation and the another partial document are included in one identical partial document, the new parts data in the storage unit* (Col. 11, lines 14-63).

<u>Anuff</u> also teaches *<u>deleting parts data</u> corresponding to the partial document targeted for operation from the storage unit* in that an end user has the ability to delete individual portlets (partial documents) from their portal page. Though not stated explicitly, the act of deleting a portlet from a portal page would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, as it would have typically involved removing everything associated with that portlet from the users page including the claimed *parts data*. Similarly, an administrator can also delete portlets. One advantage of having a delete wipe out all components of a given portlet would have been to provide the "deleter" with additional storage space.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

8.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

9.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
01/30/2006

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
2/14/2006